

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

OWEN SUKEL<sup>1</sup>,

Respondent Below,  
Appellant,

v.

JOY EISEL,

Petitioner Below,  
Appellee.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

No. 158, 2019

Court Below: Family Court  
of the State of Delaware

File No. CK18-03019

Petition No. 18-35668

Submitted: February 28, 2020

Decided: April 21, 2020

Before **SEITZ**, Chief Justice; **TRAYNOR** and **MONTGOMERY-REEVES**,  
Justices.

**ORDER**

After careful consideration of the parties' briefs and the record on appeal, we find it evident that the judgment of the Family Court should be affirmed on the basis of and for the reasons assigned in the Family Court's well-reasoned March 14, 2019 order, which affirmed the Commissioner's order granting the appellee's petition for a protection from abuse order. The Family Court did not abuse its discretion in

---

<sup>1</sup> The Court previously assigned pseudonyms to the parties under Supreme Court Rule 7(d).

accepting the Commissioner's order,<sup>2</sup> and the appellant's allegation of bias on the part of either the Family Court or the Commissioner is not supported by the record.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the judgment of the Family Court is AFFIRMED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Tamika R. Montgomery-Reeves  
Justice

---

<sup>2</sup> See *King v. Booker*, 2015 WL 4985367, at \*2 (“If the Family Court has correctly applied the law, our standard of review is abuse of discretion.”).